

Boundary of Picard group of a singular curve

Jyotsna Gokhale

Mehta Research Institute
10 Kasturba Gandhi Street
Allahabad 211002
India

E-mail : jgokhale@mri.ernet.in

Introduction:

Picard group $Pic\ C$ of a curve C is a projective variety iff C is non-singular. The most natural compactification of $Pic^0 C$ is $(Pic^0 C)^=$, the family of torsion - free sheaves of degree 0 and rank one on C [MM]; it is irreducible if and only if the embedding dimension of the C is at most two at every point on C [D], [AIK], [R], [K]. It is enough to look at one singularity at a time [SK]. In this work ¹ we study modules over the local ring of an integral curve C with one singularity Q of embedding dimension more than two to determine $(\overline{Pic^0 C})$ in $(Pic^0 C)^=$. $\diamond$

Notation:

¹ This work was done during '84 - '86 at Brandeis as part of my doctoral dissertation, and forms the first chapter thereof. Some changes were made during May '92 before sending this paper for publication, most notable being the formulation of a functor and proof of its representability by a projective scheme, with consequent change of language of the paper. The concept behind this functor, and the use that has been made of it, is same as in my dissertation.

It was brought to my notice (August '92) that G.Pfister and J.H.M.Steenbrink have recently ('91) published a paper similar in content to the second part of my dissertation. I have taken care therefore to refer to [PS] wherever there is any part common, omitting repetition of already published proofs.

It is a duty and a pleasure to thank my advisor David Eisenbud for all the insight and the constructive comments he provided me with, and for the atmosphere highly conducive to work that he generates around him.

k	an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero
C	an integral curve over k with one unibranch singularity Q
$C^\sim$	normalisation of C
π	the normalisation map
$\mathcal{O}$	completion of local ring of C at Q
$\mathcal{O}^\sim$	normalisation of $\mathcal{O}$
$\mathcal{M}$	maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}$
$\mathcal{C}$	the conductor $Hom_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{O}^\sim, \mathcal{O})$ of C
$\mathcal{M}_Q$	maximal ideal sheaf of Q
$\mathcal{C}_Q$	conductor sheaf
$\mathcal{W}_C^0$	the canonical dualising sheaf of C
δ	$rk_k(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{O})$; we omit the subscript k normally
$\mathcal{F}$	torsion free sheaf of rank one
$\mathcal{L}$	a locally free sheaf of rank 1
C^D	a partial normalization of C defined (section 1) uniquely for any $D \subseteq \pi^*(Q)$
C'	first partial normalization of unibranch C such that $rk_k(\mathcal{O}'/\mathcal{O}) = 1$ and $C' \neq \mathcal{C}$; i.e., $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O} + t^{-1}\mathcal{C}$.
C^i	successive partial normalizations defined along the same line
$\mathcal{M}^i$	maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}^i$
$\mathcal{C}^i$	the conductor of C^i
$Pic^0 C$	Picard group of degree 0 of C
π^*	the map $Pic^0 C \longrightarrow Pic^0 C^\sim$ of Picard groups corresponding to π
K	$ker(\pi^*)$
$(Pic^0 C)^\sim$	moduli of torsion free sheaves of degree 0 and rank one.
$\overline{S}$	Zariski closure of a variety or scheme S
$\overline{(Pic^0 C)}$	Zariski closure of $Pic^0 C$ in $(Pic^0 C)^\sim$
$B(\overline{Pic^0 C})$	boundary of $\overline{Pic^0 C}$, def(0.1)
$\chi(\mathcal{F})$	Euler characteristic of $\mathcal{F}$
$deg(\mathcal{F})$	$\chi(\mathcal{F}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_C)$
Γ	$\Gamma(C) = (k_1, \dots, k_r) \mathbf{N}$, the semigroup of orders of generators of $\mathcal{O}$ over k , assuming $2 < k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_r$
v_0	order of the conductor, i.e., $\mathcal{C} = t^{v_0}\mathcal{O}^\sim$
t	any local parameter of $\mathcal{O}^\sim$.

◇

2

² Γ^* of [PS] is analogous to our C' in case of a unibranch singularity.

0: Preliminaries

We define $(Pic_C^d)^=(S) = \{ \text{isomorphism classes of torsion free } \mathcal{O}_C(S) \text{-modules of degree } d \text{ and rank } 1 \}$. $(Pic_C^d)^=$ is representable and is represented by a projective scheme $(Pic^d C)^=$ [D], [AK], which is irreducible [R], [K], iff $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2) \leq 2$. We define the boundary of $\overline{Pic C}$, a la [R]:

Definition 0.1: $\mathcal{F} \in B(\overline{Pic^0 C})$ if $\mathcal{F} \notin Pic^0 C$, and there exists $\mathcal{G}$, an $\mathcal{O}_{C \times \text{Spec } k[[t]]}$ -module which is flat over $k[[t]]$, such that $(\mathcal{G}/t\mathcal{G}) \approx \mathcal{F}$ and the stalk of $\mathcal{G}$ at the generic point of $\text{Spec}(k[[t]])$ is a locally free $\mathcal{O}_C$ -module. $\parallel$

In other words, we have a one-parameter family, $\{\mathcal{L}_\beta\} \subseteq Pic^0 C$, with $\mathcal{F}$ in the closure. Let $K = \ker(\pi^*)$ where $\pi^* : Pic^0 C \rightarrow Pic^0 C^\sim$ is the map of respective Picard groups corresponding to the normalization map $\pi : C^\sim \rightarrow C$. Then Rego proves

[R,1.2]: $\mathcal{F} \in \overline{Pic^0 C}$ iff $\exists \mathcal{L} \in Pic^0 C$ such that $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L} \in \overline{K}$. $\parallel$

For $d \leq rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim/C)$ Rego defines a functor

$$E(\mathcal{C}, d)(S) = \{ \text{isomorphism classes of } \mathcal{O}_S\text{-modules } F_S \mid \\ \mathcal{C} \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_S \subseteq F_S \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim \otimes \mathcal{O}_S, \text{ and } rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim \otimes \mathcal{O}_S/F_S) = d \}$$

and shows that it is representable by a projective scheme, also called $E(\mathcal{C}, d)$; we identify $E(\mathcal{C}, d)$ with its image in $(Pic^0 C)^=$. In particular, since $K \subseteq E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, every boundary point “defines an element of $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ ” [R, Th.2.3(b)]. So it is enough to consider limits of one - parameter families of free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules $\{F_\beta\} \subseteq E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ parameterized by $k[[\beta]]$. A free module $\mathcal{G} \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)(k(\beta))$ is necessarily of the kind $\mathcal{G} = \partial_\beta \mathcal{O}$, $\partial_\beta \in [\mathcal{O} \otimes k(\beta)]^*$. We shall write $\partial_\beta \mathcal{O} \rightarrow F$ if F is in the closure of such a family.

Example 1: $\mathcal{O} = k[s^5, s^2t^3, st^4, t^5], \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}' = k[s^3, st^2, st^3]$, and $\mathcal{M} = (t^3, t^4, t^5)$. Let $W = \mathcal{O} + t\mathcal{O} \approx \mathcal{W}_{C,Q}^0$ be the stalk of canonical dualizing sheaf $\mathcal{W}_C^0$. We can construct deformations, using $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, as follows: since $\mathcal{O}' \approx t\mathcal{O}' \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ with $ord_t(t\mathcal{O}') = 1$, look for $\partial_\beta \in (\mathcal{O}^\sim)^*$ of the form $\partial_\beta = t + \beta\partial'_\beta$, $\partial'_\beta \in (\mathcal{O}^\sim)^*$. In fact, $t + \beta$ will do : $(t + \beta)\mathcal{O} = (t + \beta, t^3, t^4, t^5) \rightarrow (t, t^3, t^4, t^5) = t\mathcal{O}'$. Similarly $\mathcal{M} \approx t^{-1}\mathcal{M} \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$; $(t^2 + \beta a_1 t + \beta^2 a_0)\mathcal{O} \rightarrow t^{-1}\mathcal{M}$ for any $a_1 \in K$ and any $a_0 \in k^*$. Up to isomorphism $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}', \mathcal{M}$ and W the only $\mathcal{O}$ -modules; since for any $F \approx W$, necessarily $F \notin E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, W has no possible deformation by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules. Therefore $(Pic^0 C)^=$ has one component other than $\overline{Pic^0 C}$, namely, the Zariski closure of $Pic^2 C$ -orbit of $\mathcal{W}_C^0$. $\diamond$

We will close the section with some remarks assumed and used in in this work. Since $v_0 - \delta$ is used frequently, we will use notation $v_0 - \delta = \gamma$ for ease of reading.

Remarks:

- (0.2) Since $\#\{j \in \mathbf{N} \mid j \notin \Gamma\} = \delta$, so $\#\{j \in \Gamma \mid j < v_0\} = \gamma$.
- (0.3) $j \in \Gamma \implies v_0 - 1 - j \notin \Gamma \ \forall j \in \mathbf{Z}$. The converse is true iff C is Gorenstein [HK].
- (0.4) (i) $\delta - 1 \leq v_0 \leq 2\delta$.
(ii) $\#\{j \in \mathbf{N} \mid j, v_0 - 1 - j \notin \Gamma\} = 2\delta - v_0$.
- (0.5) If F is an $\mathcal{O}$ -module such that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq F \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$, and $\text{End}(F)$ does not contain $t^{-1}\mathcal{O}$, then $\mathcal{O} \subset F \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$, and $v_0 - \delta \leq rk(F/\mathcal{C}) < \delta$. Further, if $rk(F/\mathcal{C}) = \delta$ then $F \approx \mathcal{W}_{C,Q}^0$ necessarily. Conversely, for $j : v_0 - \delta \leq j \leq \delta$, there exists an F such that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq F \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$, $rk(F/\mathcal{C}) = j$, and $\text{End}(F)$ does not contain $t^{-1}\mathcal{C}$.
- (0.6) The following are equivalent:
(i) $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1$.
(ii) $k_i = ik_1 \ \forall i \leq \gamma, \ k_i \in \Gamma$.
(iii) $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + t\mathcal{C}) = 1$.
- (0.7) $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ is irreducible $\iff \overline{K} = E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$.
- (0.8) $\mathcal{M}_Q \in \overline{\text{Pic } C}$: the family $\{\mathcal{O}_C(-P) \mid P \in C, P \neq Q\}$ of locally free sheaves of rank one and degree -1 has $\mathcal{M}_Q$ in the closure.
- (0.9) If $\mathcal{F} \in B(\overline{\text{Pic}^0 C})$ then $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_C}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_C) = \mathcal{F}^v \in B(\overline{\text{Pic}^0 C})$. This follows from the definition of $B(\overline{\text{Pic}^0 C})$. $\diamond$

1: General Singularity

Let C be an integral curve singular at one point $Q \in C$. Then $\mathcal{O}_{C^\sim, Q} = \mathcal{O}^\sim$, the normalization of $\mathcal{O}_{C, Q} = \mathcal{O}$ in the function field of C , is a semi-local domain, with maximal ideals $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$ corresponding to the points of $\text{Supp}(\pi^*Q) = \{Q_i \mid i = 1, \dots, k\} \subseteq C^\sim$. Let $\pi^*Q = \sum \{\mu_i Q_i \mid i = 1, \dots, k\}$, and let t_P denote a local parameter of $\mathcal{O}^\sim$ at P . Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the conductor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{O}^\sim, \mathcal{O})$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{O}^\sim$ as well as Q , $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{M}_1^{v_1} \dots \mathcal{M}_k^{v_k}$ for some $\{v_i \geq \mu_i \mid i = 1, \dots, k\}$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}$. We have $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1^{\mu_1} \dots \mathcal{M}_k^{\mu_k}$, and equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, $\exists g \in \mathcal{M}$ such that for any $P \in \pi^*Q$, $(g)_P = u_P(t_P^{\mu_P})$ for some $u_P \in \mathcal{O}_P^*$.

Also, if $\mu = \sum \mu_i$ and $v = \sum v_i$, then $\mu - 1 \leq \delta = rk_k(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{O}) \leq v - 1$, and $\delta = \mu - 1$ or $\delta = v - 1$ iff $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C}$.

We define $\mathcal{O}^{Q_i} = \mathcal{O} + \mathcal{M}_1^{v_1} \cdots \mathcal{M}_{i-1}^{v_{i-1}} \mathcal{M}_i^{v_i-1} \mathcal{M}_{i+1}^{v_{i+1}} \cdots \mathcal{M}_k^{v_k}$ for any $Q_i \in \pi^*Q$, and $\mathcal{O}^D$ for $D \subseteq \pi^*Q$ successively (by normalizing one point at a time). There exist partial normalizations C^P of C , for any $P \in \pi^*Q$, with $\mathcal{O}_{C^P, Q} = \mathcal{O}^P$, $\mathcal{O}_{C^P} |_{C-Q} = \mathcal{O}_C |_{C-Q}$. Therefore $rk_k(\mathcal{O}_{C^P}/\mathcal{O}_C) = 1$ and $\mathcal{C}^P \neq \mathcal{C}$. Let $\pi^P : C^P \rightarrow C$ be the partial normalization map corresponding to the natural inclusion $\mathcal{O} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}^P$.

Lemma 1.0: The following are equivalent

- (i) $\mathcal{M} \approx \mathcal{O}^D$ for some $D \subseteq \pi^*Q$
- (ii) $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 1$
- (iii) $\mathcal{M} = g\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C}$ for some $g \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof: Given an isomorphism $f : \mathcal{O}^D \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, let $g = f(1)$, so that $m = g\mathcal{O} + g\mathcal{C}^D$. This gives $g\mathcal{C}^D \subseteq \mathcal{M} \implies g\mathcal{C}^D \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, by definition of $\mathcal{C}$. Converse is obvious: if $\mathcal{M} = g\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C}$ then $g^{-1}\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$, and $\mathcal{M} = g\mathcal{O}^D$ for $\mathcal{O}^D = \mathcal{O} + g^{-1}\mathcal{C}$. $\parallel$

Theorem 1.1: $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) \subseteq \bigcup \{ \pi_*^P(Pic^{-1}C^{P=}) \mid P \in \pi^*(Q) \}$.

Proof: We need to prove that if $\mathcal{F} \in \overline{Pic^0 C}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_Q$ is not isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_Q$ then there exists a point $P \in Supp\{\pi^*Q\}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_Q$ is an $\mathcal{O}^P$ -module. If $\mathcal{F} \in \overline{Pic^0 C}$, then there exists $F \approx \mathcal{F}_Q$ such that $\mathcal{C}_Q \subseteq F \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$ and $rk(F/\mathcal{C}) = \gamma$. So $\mathcal{F}_Q$ is not isomorphic to $\mathcal{O} \iff F$ contains no unit of $\mathcal{O}^\sim \iff F \subseteq \mathcal{M}_P$ for some $P \in \pi^*Q$ where $\mathcal{M}_P$ the maximal ideal of P in $\mathcal{O}^\sim \iff F$ is an $\mathcal{O}^P$ -module for some $P \in \pi^*Q$. $\parallel$

Theorem 1.2: $\bigcup \{ \pi_*^P(\overline{Pic^{-1}C^P}) \mid P \in \pi^*(Q) \} \subseteq B(\overline{Pic^0 C})$.

Proof: Enough to prove that $\pi_*^P(Pic^{-1}C^P) \subseteq \overline{Pic^0 C} \forall i$, or, equivalently, given $P \in \pi^*Q$, there exists $\mathcal{F} \in \overline{Pic^0 C}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_Q \approx \mathcal{O}^P$. Let t_P be a local parameter of $\mathcal{O}^\sim$ at P and let $\partial_\beta = t_P - \beta$. This will do: $(t_P - \beta)\mathcal{O} \rightarrow t_P\mathcal{O}^P \approx \mathcal{O}^P$. $\parallel$

Example 2: If $\mathcal{O} = k[[t^3, t^7, t^8]]$ then $\mathcal{O}' = k[[t^3, t^5, t^7]]$ has a deformation by $\mathcal{O}$ -modules, but $A = k[[t^3, t^4]]$ does not, (nor is $\mathcal{O}'$ an A -module,) even though A is a partial normalization of singularity one less than that of $\mathcal{O}$ just as $\mathcal{O}'$ is. So the definition of C^P is relevant to determination of $B(\overline{Pic C})$. $\diamond$

Theorem 1.3: $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \bigcup \{ \pi_*^D(Pic^{-i}C^D) \mid D \subseteq \pi^*Q, \deg D = i \}$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C}$.

Proof: If $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C}$, then $\delta = v_0 - 1$, and therefore $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = E(\mathcal{C}, v_0 - 1)$.

Since $\overline{Pic^0 C} \subseteq E(C, \delta)$, $\mathcal{F} \in \overline{Pic^0 C} \implies \exists F \approx \mathcal{F}_Q$ such that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq F \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$ and $rk(F/\mathcal{C}) = 1$. Let $a \in F$, $a \notin \mathcal{C}$: then $a\mathcal{O}^\sim = \mathcal{M}_1^{i_1} \cdots \mathcal{M}_k^{i_k}$, and $F = a\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C} \approx \mathcal{O}^D$ for $D = \sum i_j Q_j$. This implies $\mathcal{F} \in \pi_*^D(Pic^{-i} C^D)$.

Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathcal{C}$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is not isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}^D$ for any $D \subseteq \pi^* Q$, then the sheaf $\mathcal{M}_Q$ is a counterexample, since $\mathcal{M}_Q$ has a deformation by locally free sheaves. If on the other hand $\mathcal{M} \approx \mathcal{O}^D$ for some $D \subseteq \pi^* Q$ then $\mathcal{M} = g\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C}$ for some $g \in \mathcal{O}$. We will show the existence of f such that (i) $\mathcal{M} + f\mathcal{O}$ has a deformation by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules, and (ii) $\mathcal{M} + f\mathcal{O}$ is not isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}^D$ for any $D \subseteq \pi^* Q$.

Let $r = rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{C})$. For $P \in \pi^* Q$ let t_P be a local parameter at P . If $g^r t_P \mathcal{O} + \mathcal{M}$ is not isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}^P$, we set $f = t_P g^r$. If $g^r t_P \mathcal{O} + \mathcal{M} \approx \mathcal{O}^P$ then $t_P^{-1} g^r \mathcal{O} + \mathcal{M}$ is not isomorphic to any $\mathcal{O}^D$, so $t_P^{-1} g^r = f$ will do. In either case $F = f\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{M}$ is not isomorphic to any $\mathcal{O}^D$, and $(f + \beta)\mathcal{O} = (f + \beta, g)\mathcal{O} \supseteq \mathcal{M}$, so $(f + \beta)\mathcal{O} \longrightarrow F = f\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{M}$ and hence the theorem. $\parallel$

The first examples of a reducible $(Pic^0 C)^\sim$ are provided by $\delta = 2$.

Lemma 1.4: If $\delta = 2$, then $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2) = 2 \iff \mathcal{M} \neq \mathcal{C}$.

Proof: If $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C}$, then $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2) = rk(\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{C}^2) = rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{C}) = rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{M}) = 3$. If not, we have $rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{M}) = \delta + 1 > \mu$, so that $\mu < 3$. But $rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{C}) > rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{M}) = 3$, $\implies \sum_1^k v_i > 3$. Now, $\mathcal{O}^\sim$ has at most two maximal ideals $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$, and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1 \mathcal{M}_2$ as an $\mathcal{O}$ -submodule; if $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1^2 \mathcal{M}_2$, then since $rk(\mathcal{O}^\sim/\mathcal{M}_1^2 \mathcal{M}_2) = 3$ we must have $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1^2 \mathcal{M}_2$, and therefore $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{M}$, a contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{M}$ is not contained in $\mathcal{M}_i^2 \mathcal{M}_j$. For the same reason $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{M}_i^2 \mathcal{M}_j$, $\iff \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1^2 \mathcal{M}_2 \cap \mathcal{M}_1 \mathcal{M}_2^2$, since $v_1, v_2 > 1$. Therefore $\exists a \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $a = a_1 a_2$, $a_i \in \mathcal{M}_i - \mathcal{M}_i^2$, $a \notin \mathcal{M}_i^2 \mathcal{M}_j$; i.e., a_i must generate $\mathcal{M}_i$ locally. But then $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2) = 2$, since $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2) \leq rk(\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}\mathcal{C}) \leq rk(\mathcal{C}/a\mathcal{C}) = 2$. $\parallel$

2: $Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$:

For rest of this work C will be assumed to have a unibranch singularity Q ; i.e., $\pi^* Q$ is supported at one point $Q \in C^\sim$. (See Notation). $\mathcal{O}$ has a unique filtration $\mathcal{O} \supseteq I_1 = \mathcal{M} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq I_{v_0 - \delta - 1} \supseteq \mathcal{C}$ such that $rk(I_j/I_{j+1}) = 1$ and $\text{ord}_t I_j < \text{ord}_t I_{j+1}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, \gamma - 1$. Since $I_j = (\mathcal{O}^j)^v$, from (0.9)

Lemma 2.0: If $\mathcal{F} \in (Pic^0 C)^\sim$ such that $\mathcal{F}_Q \approx I_j$, then $\mathcal{F} \in B(\overline{Pic^0 C})$. $\parallel$

An $\mathcal{O}$ -module F has a unique filtration analogous to that of $\mathcal{O}$ given by $F \supseteq F_1 \supseteq \cdots$ such that $F_{i+1} \subseteq t F_i \mathcal{O}^\sim$ and $rk(F_i/F_{i+1}) = 1$. If moreover $F \in E(C, \delta - r - 1)$ then $F_{r+1} = \mathcal{C}$, and if F has a deformation by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules then $F_i \subseteq t^{k_i} \mathcal{O}^\sim$ for all $i = 0 \cdots \gamma - 1$. This motivates the following construction :

Definition 2.1: $Filt_{\mathcal{C}}^{\delta}(S) = \{F_S \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)(S) \mid (F_S)_j \subseteq I_j \mathcal{O}^{\sim} \ \forall j \geq 0\}$, where $(F_S)_j$ is the j th module in the unique filtration $F_S \supset (F_S)_1 \supset \cdots \supset \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_S$ such that $ord_t(F_S)_j < ord_t(F_S)_{j+1} \ \forall j$, and $(F_S)_j/(F_S)_{j+1}$ is a rank one locally free $\mathcal{O}_S$ -module. $\parallel$

Next we define an extension of $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ and use it to show that $Filt_{\mathcal{C}}^{\delta}$ is representable by a projective scheme $Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \{F \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) \mid F_j \subseteq I_j \mathcal{O}^{\sim}, \ 0 \leq j \leq \gamma - 1\}$. Let $\tilde{I}$ be any ideal of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$, with $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \tilde{I}$, and let $d \leq rk(\tilde{I}/\mathcal{C})$.

Definition 2.2: $E(\mathcal{C}, \tilde{I}, d)(S) = \{\mathcal{O} \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_S\text{-modules } F_S \mid \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{O}_S \subseteq F_S \subseteq \tilde{I} \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_S \text{ and } \tilde{I} \otimes \mathcal{O}_S/F_S \text{ is a locally free } \mathcal{O}_S\text{-module of rank } d\}$. $\parallel$

Rego's proof of representability of $E(\mathcal{C}, d)$ [R, (2.,1)] carries over with a minor change -i.e., replacing $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ by $\tilde{I}$ - so we have

Lemma 2.3: $E(\mathcal{C}, \tilde{I}, d)$ is representable by a projective scheme. $\parallel$

We shall denote the scheme representing $E(\mathcal{C}, \tilde{I}, d)$ by the same. For any $F \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, necessarily $F_j \in E(\mathcal{C}, \bar{I}_j, k_{\gamma-j} - \gamma + j)$ where $\bar{I}_j = t^{v_0 - k_{\gamma-j}} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. Also, $t^{k_j} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \tilde{I}_j \subseteq \bar{I}_j$. So for $j \leq \gamma - 1$ we have morphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) & & F \\ \varphi_j \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ E(\mathcal{C}, \tilde{I}_j, d_j) & \xrightarrow{id} & E(\mathcal{C}, \bar{I}_j, \bar{d}_j) & F_j \end{array}$$

which are proper since $E(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{I}, d)$ are projective. Now

$$F \in Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta) \iff F_j \in E(\mathcal{C}, t^{k_j} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}, \delta + j - k_j) \ \forall \ j \leq \gamma - 1,$$

so

$$Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \bigcap_{j=0}^{\gamma} \varphi_j^{-1}(E(\mathcal{C}, t^{k_j} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}, \delta + j - k_j)).$$

This proves

Theorem 2.4: $Filt_{\mathcal{C}}^{\delta}$ is representable by a projective scheme. $\parallel$

There is an obvious map $Filt_{\mathcal{C}}^{\delta} \longrightarrow Pic_{\mathcal{C}}^{0=}$, and the image in $(Pic^0 C)^{=}$ is $Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$. Since $\mathcal{O} \in Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, we have $K \subseteq Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta) \subseteq E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$. We shall skip the proof of the following:

Lemma 2.5.1: If $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 1$ and $v_0 \geq k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$, then $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$.

Lemma 2.5.2: If $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, then one of the following conditions hold good:

- (i) If $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 1$ then $v_0 \geq k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$.
- (ii) If $v_0 < k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$ then $v_0 - k_1 \leq k_{\gamma-2}$ and $k_{\gamma-1} \leq v_0 - k_{\gamma-1} + k_{\gamma-2}$; moreover for any $j \in \{2, \dots, \gamma - 2\}$ such that $v_0 - k_1 < k_j$, it follows that $k_j \leq v_0 - k_{\gamma-1} + k_{j-1}$. ||

In general $\overline{K} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ is not true. Consider

Example 3: $\mathcal{O} = k[[t^{k_1}, t^{k_1+2}]] + t^{k_1+4}\mathcal{O}^\sim$ and $F = (t^4, t^{k_1+1}, t^{k_1+2}) + \mathcal{C}$. If there is an $\partial_\beta \in \mathcal{O}^{\sim*}$ giving a deformation of F , then necessarily $\partial_\beta = t^4 + \beta\partial'_\beta$ and since $F_1 = (t^{k_1+1}, t^{k_1+2}) + \mathcal{C}$, $\partial'_\beta = t + \beta\partial''_\beta$. This contradicts with $\text{ord}_t F_2 = k_1 + 2$. ◇

Lemma 2.6: If $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 1$, then $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$.

Proof: Let $\text{ord}_t F = h$. If $rk((t^h\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{C}) = \gamma$, then $F = t^h\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C} \approx t^h\mathcal{O}^h$ and F has a deformation. If $rk((t^h\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{C}) < \gamma$, set $r = rk(F/t^h\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C})$. We may assume $F = (t^h, f_1, \dots, f_r)\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C}$, where f_i have increasing orders, $v_0 - (\gamma - r)k_1 \leq h < v_0 - (\gamma - r - 1)k_1$ by definition of r , and for $i = 1, \dots, r$, $rk([f_i, \dots, f_r] + \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{C}) = r - i + 1$, so that $\text{ord}_t f_i \geq (\gamma - r - 1 + i)k_1$. Using the condition on $\text{ord}_t f_i$, we construct ∂_β such that $\partial_\beta\mathcal{O} = (\partial_\beta, f_1 + \beta f'_1, f_2 + \beta f'_2, \dots, f_r + \beta f'_r)$ for some $\{f'_1, f'_2, \dots, f'_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$, so that $\partial_\beta\mathcal{O} \longrightarrow F$. Let $\partial_\beta = t^h + \beta g^{-(\gamma-r)}f_1 + \beta^2 g^{-(\gamma-r-1)}f_2 + \dots + \beta g^{-(\gamma-1)}f_r + \beta^{r+1}$. It is easy to check that we have constructed the requisite ∂_β . ||

Corollary 2.6.1: If $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 1$ and $v_0 \geq k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$, then $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$.

Example 4: The converse of (2.6) is not true : for $\mathcal{O} = k[[s^6, s^2t^4, st^5, t^6]]$, every $\mathcal{O}$ -module $F \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ has a deformation by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules. This can be seen explicitly : if $\text{ord}_t F = 1$ then $F = t\mathcal{O}'$ necessarily; if $\text{ord}_t F = 2$ and $F \neq t^2\mathcal{O}''$ then $F = (t^2, ut^4) + \mathcal{C}$ for $u \in \mathcal{O}^{\sim*}$, and $\partial_\beta = t^2 + \beta u$ will do; if $\text{ord}_t F = 3$ then F is in the closure of the Picard orbit of $(t^3, t^4, t^5) + \mathcal{C} = t^{-1}\mathcal{M}$, and $\text{ord}_t F = r, \iff F = t^4\mathcal{O}^\sim$. Hence $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$. ◇

As example(2) shows, $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$ is not true in general even in case $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 2$, although it holds for $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 3$ in example(3). However, using (2.5) and (2.6) we have

Theorem 2.7: If $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$ then one of the conditions of (2.5.2) holds good. Moreover

- (i) in case 2.5.2(i), if $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1, rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) \neq 1$ then $k_1 \leq 4$,

and

- (ii) in case of 2.5.2(ii), if $v_0 - k_1 = k_{\gamma-2}$ then $k_1 = 2n + 3 \geq 5$ and $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 2 = k_{\gamma-3} + 2k_1 - 2$.

Proof: If $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$, then trivially $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, i.e., hypothesis of (2.5.2) holds; so either 2.5.2(i) or 2.5.2(ii) must hold.

To show (i), if $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$, $k_{\gamma-2} + k_1 > k_{\gamma-1}$ and $k_1 > 4$ then $F \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) - \overline{K}$ for $F = (t^{k_1+4}, t^{v_0-k_1}, t^{v_0-k_1+2}, t^{v_0-k_1+4})\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C}$.

To show (ii), Suppose conditions of 2.5.2(ii) hold, so that we have $v_0 < k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$ and $k_{\gamma-1} \leq v_0 - k_{\gamma-1} + k_{\gamma-2}$; and suppose that $v_0 - k_1 = k_{\gamma-2}$.

We set $h = v_0 - k_{\gamma-1}$, $F = (t^h, t^{h'})\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C}$ with $v_0 - k_1 \leq h' < k_{\gamma-1}$ chosen so that $F \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ and $\text{ord}_t F_{\gamma-2} = h'$. If F has a deformation $\{a_\beta \mathcal{O}\}$ by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules then necessarily $a_\beta = t^h + \beta t^{h+k_{\gamma-2}-k_{\gamma-1}} + \beta^2$, $a_\beta \in (\mathcal{O}^\sim \otimes k[[\beta]])^*$ in order to have $a_\beta \longrightarrow t^h$ and $\{a_\beta I_{\gamma-1}\} \longrightarrow t^h$ and $\{a_\beta I_{\gamma-1}\} \longrightarrow F_{\gamma-1}$. Since we need $\{a_\beta I_{\gamma-2}\} \longrightarrow F_{\gamma-2}$ either $h + 2k_{\gamma-2} - k_{\gamma-1} = h'$ or $h + 2k_{\gamma-2} - k_{\gamma-1} \geq k_{\gamma-1}$, so that a_β can be modified further.

In the second case let $h_j = h + j(k_{\gamma-2} - k_{\gamma-1})$, $n = \max\{j \mid h_j > 0\}$ and $a_{\beta j} = t^h + \beta^{h_1} + \dots + \beta^j t^{h_j} + \beta^{j+1}$, for $j \leq n$. If $\{a_\beta \mathcal{O}\} \longrightarrow F$ then $a_\beta = a_{\beta j}$ for some j . But $\{a_{\beta j} I_{\gamma-2}\} \longrightarrow G_j$, $\text{ord}_t G_j = \min\{k_{\gamma-2} + h_j, k_{\gamma-1}\}$. Since $\{h_j\}$ are not consecutive we may choose h' to avoid them so that $F \notin \overline{K}$, unless $\{v_0 - k_1, v_0 - k_1 + 1, \dots, k_{\gamma-1}\} \subseteq \{h + k_{\gamma-3}, h_j, k_{\gamma-1} \mid j \leq n\}$ which is only possible for $h + k_{\gamma-3} = v_0 - k_1$, $k_{\gamma-1} = k_{\gamma-2} + 2$ and $h_n = v_0 - k_1 + 1$, i.e., the conclusion of the statement; $k_1 = 2n + 3 \geq 5$ in this case. Since the case $h' = h + 2k_{\gamma-2} - k_{\gamma-1}$ is included in the discussion above, we are through. $\parallel$

Example 5: If $\mathcal{O} = k[[t^4, t^{13}, t^{18}, t^{19}]]$ and $\Gamma(F) = \{5, 9, 11, 13, 14\} \cup \Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ then $F \notin \overline{K}$. So for $k_1 \leq 4$, it is not necessarily true that if $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$ and $\text{rk}(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) \neq 1$ then $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$. $\diamond$

Lemma 2.8: If $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$ and $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$ then $\text{rk}(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) = 1$ unless either (i) $k_1 \mid v_0, k_1 \leq 3$ or (ii) $k_1 \mid v_0 + 1, k_1 \leq 4$

Proof: If $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1 - 1$ and $\text{rk}(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + \mathcal{C}) \neq 1$ then $k_{\gamma-2} = v_0 - k_1$ and $k_{i+1} - k_i \in \{1, k_1 - 1, k_1\} \forall i$. Also, not more than two k_i can be consecutive $\forall i < \gamma$. Therefore, either $k_1 \mid k_{\gamma-2}$ or $k_1 \mid k_{\gamma-1}$, and so either

(i) $\Gamma = \{k_1, \dots, nk_1, nk_1 + 1, \dots, mk_1, mk_1 + 1; (m+1)k_1 = v_0, \dots\}$,

or

(ii) $\Gamma = \{k_1, \dots, (n-1)k_1, nk_1 - 1, nk_1, \dots, mk_1 - 1, mk_1; (m+1)k_1 - 1 = v_0, \dots\}$.

Set $F = (t^{k_1}, t^{nk_1+2}, t^{mk_1+3})\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C}$. Then $F \in \text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ but $F \notin \overline{K}$ unless $k_1 \leq 3$ in case (i) or $k_1 \leq 4$ in case (ii). $\parallel$

3: $B(\overline{\text{Pic}^0 \mathcal{C}})$

We would like to explore the question of when the inequalities in (1.1) and (1.2) become equalities. The first, namely, $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_*(\overline{Pic^{-1} C'})$ is true for $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C}$, but also for a much larger category of curves. It ties in with (2.6.1) and (2.7) to give a better answer to the previous topic. Let $\mathcal{F} \in \overline{Pic^0 C}$, $\mathcal{F} \notin Pic^0 C$, and $F \approx \mathcal{F}_Q$ such that $F \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$. If $\mathcal{F} \in \overline{Pic^{-1} C'}$, then $\exists F' \approx F$ such that $F' \in E(\mathcal{C}', \delta - 1)$. Since $E(\mathcal{C}', \delta - 1) \subseteq E(\mathcal{C}, \delta - 1)$, necessarily $tF' = F$, or $F \supseteq t\mathcal{C}'$, for some local parameter t at Q .

Lemma 3.1: If $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_*(\overline{Pic^{-1} C'})$, then $rk_k(\mathcal{C}'/\mathcal{C}) = 1$ unless $k_1 = 2$.

Proof: Suppose $k_1 \neq 2$. If C is Gorenstein, then $v_1 = v_0 - k_1$. Take $F = t^{-1}\mathcal{M}$. Since $t^{-1}\mathcal{M} \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ and the sheaf $\mathcal{M}_Q$ is in the completion of the family $\{\mathcal{O}_C(-P) \mid P \in C, P \neq Q\}$ we know that an ∂_β giving a deformation of F exists. On the other hand $\mathcal{C}'$ is not contained in $t^{-2}\mathcal{M}$, so F has no deformation by free $\mathcal{O}'$ -modules.

If C is not Gorenstein, this argument may not work for $v_1 = v_0 - 2$. However, we can construct a counterexample by using the fact that $2\delta - v_0 = \#\{j \mid j, v_0 - 1 - j \notin \Gamma\} > 0$ (which, therefore, works only for non-Gorenstein curves,) as follows : Set $\partial_\beta = a_0 + a_1 t + \dots + a_{v_0-1} t^{v_0-1}$, where $a_i = 0$ if $v_0 - 1 - i \in \Gamma$, and $a_i = \beta^{v_0-1-i}$ otherwise. Let $\partial_\beta \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow F$. Since C is not Gorenstein, $F \neq \mathcal{O}$. On the other hand F does not contain $t^{-1}C$ by construction, so $t^{-1}F \supseteq \mathcal{C}'$ iff $\mathcal{C}' = t^{-1}C$. $\parallel$

The converse is not true : $rk_k(\mathcal{C}'/\mathcal{C}) = 1$ is a necessary but not sufficient condition for $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_*(\overline{Pic^{-1} C'})$.

Example 6: Let $\mathcal{O}$ be given by $\mathcal{O} = k[[t^{k_1}]] + t^{2k_1-1}\mathcal{O}^\sim$, and let $\partial_\beta = t^{k_1-1} + \beta$. Then $F = (t^{k_1-1}, t^{k_1})\mathcal{O} + C$, $\mathcal{O}' = k[[t^{k_1}]] + t^{2k_1-2}\mathcal{O}^\sim$, and $t^{-1}F = (t^{k_1-2}, t^{k_1-1})\mathcal{O}' + C'$. Since $t^{-1}F \notin Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta - 1)$, therefore $t^{-1}F \notin \overline{K'}$. $\diamond$

However, we can obtain a sharper result using (3.1), (0.6) and (1.0).

Theorem 3.2: $B(\overline{Pic^{-1} C}) = \pi'_*(\overline{Pic^{-1} C'}) \iff rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + t\mathcal{C}) = 1$.

Proof: $\implies$: Let $v_0 < k_{\gamma-1} + k_1$, and $\partial_\beta = (t^{k_{\gamma-1}} + 1) + \beta$. Then $F = \mathcal{M} + (t^{k_{\gamma-1}} + 1)\mathcal{O}$, and F does not contain $t^{-1}C$, since $k_{\gamma-1} < v_0 - 1$ by the previous lemma. If $\partial'_\beta \mathcal{O}' \longrightarrow t^{-1}F = t^{-1}\mathcal{M} + I'_{\gamma-1}$, necessarily $\partial_\beta I'_\gamma \longrightarrow I'_\gamma$ on one hand and $\partial'_\beta I'_j \longrightarrow \partial'_\beta I'_{j-1} \forall j < \gamma - 1$ on the other hand. Therefore $ord_\beta a_0 < ord_\beta a_j \forall j < v_0 - k_{\gamma-1}$, so that $k_{\gamma-1} - k_{\gamma-2} \geq v_0 - k_{\gamma-1}$. Set $\partial''_\beta = t^{k_{\gamma-1}-1} + \beta$, so that $\partial_\beta \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow F'' = \mathcal{M} + (t^{k_{\gamma-1}-1})\mathcal{O}$ and $t^{-1}F'' \notin Filt(\mathcal{C}', \delta - 1)$. If no such ∂'_β exists, F is already a counterexample, so we are through.

$\Leftarrow$: Let $v_0 = k_{\gamma-1} + k_1$, $\iff k_i = ik_1$ for all $k_i \in \Gamma$ such that $k_i < v_0 + 1$. Let $g \in \mathcal{O}$ “generate” $\mathcal{M}$, i.e., $\mathcal{M} = g\mathcal{O} + t\mathcal{C}$. Let $\partial_\beta \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow F$, $\text{ord}_t F = h$. If $h < k_1$, necessarily $F \approx t^h \mathcal{O}^h$, so that F has a deformation $\partial'_\beta \mathcal{O}' \longrightarrow t^{-1}F$. If $h > k_1 - 1$, set $j = rk(F/t^h \mathcal{O} + \mathcal{C})$. We must have $F = t^h \mathcal{O}^h + (f_1, \dots, f_j)\mathcal{O}$, where $v_0 - jk_1 \leq \text{ord}_t f_1 < \text{ord}_t f_2 < \dots < \text{ord}_t f_j < v_0$, and $v_0 - (j-i+1)k_1 \leq \text{ord}_t f_i \forall i$. We shall separate two cases: first, let $h = jk_1$, so that $\text{ord}_t f_i > v_0 - (j-i+1)k_1 \forall i$. Take $\partial'_\beta = t^{h-1} + \beta g^{j-\gamma} t^{-1} f_1 + \dots + \beta^j g^{1-\gamma} t^{-1} f_j + \beta^{j+1}$, so that $\partial'_\beta \mathcal{O}'$ gives a deformation of $t^{-1}F$. If, however, $jk_1 < h < (j+1)k_1$, then possibly $\text{ord}_t f_i = v_0 - (j-i+1)k_1$, so this construction may fail. Then $\partial'_\beta \longrightarrow t^{-1}F$ for $\partial'_\beta = t^{-1} f_1 + \beta g^{-1} t^{-1} f_2 + \dots + \beta^{j-1} g^{1-j} t^{-1} f_j + \beta^j g^{-j} t^{h-1} + \beta^{j+1}$. $\parallel$

From (2.5.1), (2.5.2), (2.6), (2.6.1), (2.7) and (3.2),

Theorem (3.3): The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $rk(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}^2 + t\mathcal{C}) = 1$
- (ii) $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_* \overline{Pic^{-1} C'}$
- (iii) $E(\mathcal{C}, \delta) = \overline{K}$ and $E(\mathcal{C}', \delta - 1) = \overline{K'}$. $\parallel$

Next we would like to deal with the curves C which have the property $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_*(\overline{Pic^{-1} C'})$. We know that this is true if C is locally planar, or if $\delta = 2$. In general, this will be true whenever C' is locally planar. But

Lemma 3.4: C' is Gorenstein $\iff$ either $v_0 > k_1 = 2$ or $v_0 = k_1 < 4$.

Proof: Let C' be Gorenstein, so that $v_1 = 2\delta - 2$, $v_i = v_1 - k_{i-1}$ for all $i > 0$, and $2\delta - 2 < v_0 < 2\delta + 1$. Suppose $v_0 > k_1$. If $v_0 = 2\delta - 1$, $v_2 = v_0 - 1 - k_1 \in \Gamma$, which is not possible. If $v_0 = 2\delta$, C is Gorenstein, so $v_1 = v_0 - k_1 \implies k_1 = 2$. Rest of the assertion is obvious. $\parallel$

These, however are not all :

Example 7: $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_*((\overline{Pic^{-1} C'})^\sim)$ for C given by

$$\mathcal{O} = k[[s^7, s^4 t^3, s^2 t^5, t^7]] . \quad \diamond$$

We would like to investigate the possibility of characterizing (or at least giving a list of) curves with this property. This is partially done in the following:

Lemma 3.5: If $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_*((\overline{Pic^{-1} C'})^\sim)$ then either C is locally planar or $v_0 = 2\delta - 1$.

Proof: Let $F' = t^{v_0-v_1} W'$, where $W' \approx \mathcal{W}_{C', Q}^0$, so that F' is an $\mathcal{O}'$ -module with $\mathcal{C} \subseteq F' \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\sim$ and $rk(F'/\mathcal{C}) = \delta - 1$. If $F \approx F'$ has a deformation by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules $\partial_\beta \mathcal{O}$, then $rk(F/\mathcal{C}) = \gamma$. On the other hand $rk(F/\mathcal{C}) > rk(F'/\mathcal{C}) - 1$, since $t^{-1}\mathcal{C}$ is not contained in F' by construction. This gives $v_0 > 2\delta - 2$. But $v_0 = 2\delta$ is the Gorenstein case, where $(\overline{Pic^0 C})^\sim =$

$Pic^0 C \cup \pi'_*(Pic^{-1} C') =$, so that $\overline{(Pic^0 C)}$ is irreducible (by the hypothesis), which is equivalent to C being locally planar. $\parallel$

Suppose C is a non locally planar curve, such that $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_* Pic^{-1} C' =$ and $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathcal{C}$. We shall attempt to say as much as possible about $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ in the following. It is not yet possible for me to say whether or not the converse of (3.5) is true.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Let } F' &= t^{v_0-v_1} W', \text{ so that} \\ \Gamma(F') &= \{j \geq v_0 - v_1 \mid v_0 - 1 - j \text{ is not in } \Gamma\} \\ &= \{v_0 - v_1, v_0 - v_2, \dots, v_0 - k_1 : v_0 - k_1 + 1, \dots, v_0 - 2, v_0, \dots\}. \end{aligned}$$

3.6. Suppose $v_0 - v_1 < k_1$ and $v_1 > k_1$. Since F' has a deformation by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules and $F' \in E(\mathcal{C}, \delta)$, $v_0 - v_1 < k_1 \implies v_0 - v_i = k_{i-1} \ \forall i > 1$. This implies that if ∂_β gives a deformation of F' then $\partial_\beta = t^{v_0-v_1} + \beta$ necessarily. But then $v_1 - 1 > v_0 - k_1 - 1 \implies v_1 - 1 \in \Gamma(F')$, a contradiction. Hence either $v_1 = k_1$ or $v_0 - v_1 = k_1$.

3.7 If $v_1 = k_1$ then $\delta = k_1, \iff v_0 = 2k_1 - 1$. Set $F' = \mathcal{O}' + t\mathcal{O}' \implies rk(F'/\mathcal{C}) = \gamma + 2$. F' has a deformation by free $\mathcal{O}$ -modules, so for any $F \approx F', \exists \partial_\beta \in \mathcal{O}^{\sim*}$ giving a deformation of F if and only if $F = t^2 F'$. But then $F_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}\mathcal{O}^{\sim} \implies k_1 = 3$. This is the unique case $\Gamma = \{0, 3; 5, \dots\}$.

3.8 If $v_1 > k_1$, then $v_0 - v_1 = k_1$. It can be seen easily that $\exists! j^* < \delta - k_1 + 1$ such that $v_0 - v_i = k_i \ \forall i < j^*, \ v_0 - v_i = k_{i-1} \ \forall i > j^*$, and $v_{j^*} = \delta$.

However, all these curves do not necessarily satisfy $B(\overline{Pic^0 C}) = \pi'_*(Pic^{-1} C') =$:

Example 8: If $\Gamma = \{0, k_1, k_1 + 2, k_1 + 5, \dots, 2k_1 + 3; 2k_1 + 5, \dots\}$ and $\Gamma(F) = \{k_1, k_1 + 1, k_1 + 3, k_1 + 5, \dots, 2k_1 + 3; 2k_1 + 5, \dots\}$ then $F \in Filt(\mathcal{C}, \delta), F \notin \overline{K} \diamond$

References

- [AIK] A. Altman, A. Iarrobino and S. Kleiman, Irreducibility of the compactified Jacobian, in "Proceedings, Nordic Summer School NAVF, Oslo, Aug. 5-25, 1976," Noordhoff, Groningen, 1977.
- [AK1] A. Altman and S. Kleiman, Compactifying the Picard Scheme, Advances In Mathematics 35, 50-112 (1980).
- [AK] A. Altman and S. Kleiman, Compactifying the Picard Scheme, II, Amer. J. Math. 101 (1979) ("Zariski volume"), 10-41.

- [D] C. D'Souza, "Compactification of Generalized Jacobians," Thesis, Tata Institute, Bombay, 1973.
- [HK] Herzog and Kunz, Die Wertehalbgruppe eines Lokalen Ringes der Dimension I, Springer Verlag, 1971.
- [K] H. Kleppe, Picard scheme of a curve and its compactification. Thesis, M.I.T., 1981.
- [MM] A. Mayor and D. Mumford, Further Comments on Boundary Points, Amer. Math. Soc. Summer Institute, Woods Hole, Mass., 1964.
- [PS] G. Pfister and J.H.M. Steenbrink, Reduced Hilbert Scheme for Irreducible Curve Singularities, to appear, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra.
- [R] C. Rego, The Compactified Jacobian, Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup., 4^e serie, t. 13, 1980, p. 211 a 224.
- [SK] S. Kleiman: The structure of the compactified Jacobian : a review and an announcement; seminari di geometria, 1982-83; Universita delgi Studi di Bologna, Dipartimento Matematica, 1984.